

TH



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/624,154	07/24/2000	Peter Godlewski	16166-001800US	5073

20350 7590 07/23/2002

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

FISCHER, ANDREW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SK

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/624,154

Applicant(s)

Godlewski et al

Examiner

Andrew J. Fischer

Art Unit

3627



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claims 1-55 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                              | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other:  |

Art Unit: 3627

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Restriction***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-15 and 31-35, drawn to a method of supplying, classified in class 700, subclass 236.
  - II. Claims 16-30, drawn to a method of facilitating supplying, classified in class 705, subclass 28.
  - III. Claim 36, drawn to a host procurement application, classified in class 705, subclass 22.
  - IV. Claim 37-41, drawn to a server, classified in class 709, subclass 201.
  - V. Claim 42-55, drawn to a system, classified in class 705, subclass 21.
2. Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention II has separate utility such as a sales information recorder. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, because the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, and because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Art Unit: 3627

4. Inventions I and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the apparatus can be used to keep track of sales information.

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, because the search required for Group I is not required for Group III, and because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. Inventions I and IV are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the server can be used keep centrally located all important files.

7. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, because the search required for Group I is not required for Group IV, and because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

8. Inventions I and V are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another

Art Unit: 3627

materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the system can be used to keep centrally located all important files.

9. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, because the search required for Group I is not required for Group V, and because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

10. Inventions II and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the apparatus can be used to keep track of sales information.

11. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, because the search required for Group II is not required for Group III, and because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

12. Inventions II and IV are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice

Art Unit: 3627

another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the server can be used to keep centrally located all important files.

13. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, because the search required for Group II is not required for Group IV, and because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

14. Inventions II and V are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the server can be used to keep centrally located, all important files.

15. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, because the search required for Group II is not required for Group V, and because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

16. Inventions III and IV are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as

Art Unit: 3627

claimed because the server does not require a medium with ordering information. The subcombination has separate utility such as software to record sales volume.

17. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, because the search required for Group III is not required for Group IV, and because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

18. Inventions III and V are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the system does not require ordering information. The subcombination has separate utility such as software to record sales volume.

19. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, because the search required for Group III is not required for Group V, and because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

20. Inventions IV and V are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the

Art Unit: 3627

subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because system does not require code to poll a plurality of dispensing units. The subcombination has separate utility such as a centrally located storage facility for sales data.

21. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, because the search required for Group IV is not required for Group V, and because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

#### *Election of Species*

22. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Species 1: Represented by Figure 1; and

Species 2: Represented by Figure 2.

23. In addition to the chosen Invention (Inventions I, II, III, IV, and V above), Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The elected species must at least be capable of being used together with the chosen invention above. Currently, no claims are generic.



Art Unit: 3627

24. Applicants are advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added in response to this Office Action or in any future amendment. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

25. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, Applicants will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, Applicant must indicate which claims are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

26. Should Applicants traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, Applicants should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

27. Telephone calls were made to Darin J. Gibby on March 23, 2001 and April 3, 2001 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Art Unit: 3627


28. Applicants are advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

29. Applicants are reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).


30. All MPEP sections cited within are from the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) Eighth Edition, August 2001 unless expressly noted otherwise.

31. The art unit and technology center for this application has changed. The new art unit is 3627 in technology center 3600. So that papers may be properly matched, please indicated the new art unit on any paper submitted with this application.

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew J. Fischer whose telephone number is (703) 305-0292.

  
**ANDREW J. FISCHER**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**  
7/19/02

AJF  
July 19, 2002

 7/22/02  
**ROBERT P. OLSZEWSKI**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**